



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,895	11/30/2001	Joan C. Teng	21756-013000	4164

51206 7590 01/09/2008
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/09/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/998,895

Applicant(s)

TENG ET AL.

Examiner

Amelia Rutledge

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/26/2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13-16, 20, 21, 23-26, 30, 31, 33-36 and 39-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13-16, 20, 21, 23-26, 30, 31, 33-36 and 39-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 10/26/2007.
2. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13-16, 20, 21, 23-26, 30, 31, 33-36, and 39-46 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, 24 and 39 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13-16, 20, 21, 23-26, 30, 31, 33-36, and 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng, U.S. Patent No. 6,067,548, issued May 2000, in view of McNally, et al. (hereinafter "McNally"), U.S. Patent No. 6,823,513 B1, issued November 2004.**

Independent claim 1 cites: *A computer-implemented method for using workflows, comprising the steps of: associating workflows with one or more groups in an identity system, each group including one or more users of the identity system; receiving a request to perform a task that pertains to at least one identity profile of an entity in said identity system; and performing a first workflow for said task, said first workflow is associated with a first group that includes a target identity profile;*

Cheng teaches a method for using workflows in an identity system, using virtual links to associate a workflow with a group that includes a target identity profile (col. 3, l.

15-col. 5, l. 16). Cheng teaches that the system has organizational objects which are sub-groups of the enterprise, such as employees and departments (col. 6, l. 40-col. 7, l. 67). Cheng teaches that the organizational model of the system can be applied in workflow systems, by using the roles to assign tasks in a workflow system (col. 13, l. 9-col. 16, l. 10; col. 16, l. 10-65).

Claim 1 also cites: *said request includes an identification of said target identity profile; said step of performing includes the steps of identifying a plurality of workflows that perform said task and are associated with groups that include said target identity profile, said set plurality workflows includes said first workflow, reporting said set plurality workflows to a user via a Graphical User Interface (GUI), receiving from the user a selection of said first workflow from the plurality of workflows, and performing one or more steps of said first workflow;*

Cheng teaches that the user may use a graphical user interface to manipulate the organizational objects and tasks (col. 11, l. 52-58; col. 12, l. 64-col. 13, l. 33; Fig. 9, 10), which suggests use of a GUI to assign workflows. Cheng teaches that the organizational model of the system can be applied in workflow systems, by using the roles to assign tasks in a workflow system (col. 13, l. 9-col. 16, l. 10; col. 16, l. 10-65). However, Cheng does not explicitly teach that the GUI reports a set plurality of workflows to perform a task to the user and receives a selection of the workflow from the user. McNally is relied upon to teach a workflow distribution process with a GUI from which a user can select from a plurality of assigned workflows and perform steps of the workflow (col. 5, l. 61-col. 6, l. 59; Figs. 5-8).

Claim 1 also cites: *wherein; said first workflow comprises a predefined set of steps that perform said tasks to affect the target identity profile, said predefined set of steps comprising a first step and a second step;*

said first step is performed by a first program;

said second step is performed by a second program;

information is passed between said first program and said second program according to a defined set of rules: and

at least one of the first program and the second program is external to the workflow.

Cheng teaches that each workflow comprises a predefined set of steps by more than one program, to perform tasks to affect the identity profile or group, and passing information between first and second programs according to a defined set of rules (col. 16, l. 22-65; col. 17, l. 5-51). While Cheng does not explicitly teach that at least one of the first program and the second program is external to the workflow, McNally teaches that at least one of the first program and the second program is external to the workflow, because McNally teaches that access to program resources outside the workflow can be requested or assigned to an operator (col. 5, l. 44-col. 7, l. 52; especially col. 7, l. 3-35).

Both Cheng and McNally are directed to the assignment of workflows and rules to users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the intuitive interface disclosed by McNally to the workflow and organization modeling system disclosed by Cheng, since McNally and Cheng

recognized the need to limit access to proprietary workflow processes (McNally col. 2, l. 33-51) while facilitating collaboration between organizations (Cheng, col. 3, l. 1-12).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Cheng teaches *associating said first workflow with said first group, said step of associating said first workflow includes choosing a first entry in a data structure, said data structure is a hierarchical data structure of entities in the identity system, said first domain includes said first entry and entries below said first entry*, because Cheng teaches that the system has organizational objects which are sub-groups of the enterprise, such as employees and departments, arranged in a hierarchical data structure (col. 6, l. 40-col. 7, l. 67, Fig. 3, 4).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Cheng teaches *identifying one or more workflows associated with a target identity profile*, because Cheng teaches that the organizational model of the system can be applied in workflow systems, by using the roles to assign tasks in a workflow system (col. 13, l. 9-col. 16, l. 10; col. 16, l. 10-65).

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 6, Cheng teaches that the user can request to delete or modify a target identity profile, because Cheng teaches that the identifier and objects of the member class have a life cycle where a member, i.e., identity profile can be archived, modified, or deleted (col. 8, l. 1-51; col. 12, l. 27-64).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Cheng teaches that *said steps of associating, receiving and performing are performed by an integrated identity and access system*, because Cheng teaches a system of interconnected databases with multiple servers for identity and access (Fig. 8, col. 11, l. 4-col. 12, l. 26).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Cheng teaches that a request may be for self-registration, because Cheng teaches a user interface for self registration (col. 12, l. 18-64).

Regarding dependent claim 11, Cheng teaches that workflows can delegate work, i.e., tasks, to other workflow processes or resources (col. 13, l. 9-col. 15, l. 19).

Regarding dependent claim 13, Cheng teaches *wherein said hierarchical data structure includes an LDAP directory* (col. 15, l. 14-19, Fig. 8).

In regard to independent claim 14, claim 14 reflects the processor readable storage device(s) having processor readable code used to perform the method as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 15-21 and 23, claims 15-21 and 23 reflect the processor readable storage device(s) having processor readable code used to perform the method as claimed in claims 2, 3, 4, 7-9, 11, and 13, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 24, claim 24 reflects the apparatus used to perform the method as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 25-33, claims 25-31 and 33 reflect the apparatus used to perform the method as claimed in claims 2, 3, 4, 7-9, 11, and 13, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 34, Cheng teaches *managing a target identity profile*, because Cheng teaches that the identifier and objects of the member class have

a life cycle where a member, i.e., identity profile can be archived, modified, or deleted (col. 8, l. 1-51; col. 12, l. 27-64).

Regarding dependent claim 35, Cheng teaches *wherein managing said identity profile comprises one or more tasks selected from the group consisting of: creating a user, deleting a user, changing a user attribute, creating a group, deleting a group, and changing a group attribute*, because Cheng teaches that the identifier and objects of the member class have a life cycle where a member, i.e., identity profile can be archived, modified, or deleted (col. 8, l. 1-51; col. 12, l. 27-64).

Regarding dependent claim 36, Cheng teaches managing certificates associated with identity profiles (col. 15, l. 4-19).

Regarding independent claim 39, Cheng teaches *associating workflows with one or more groups in an identity system, each group including one or more users of the identity system and each user of the identity system having an associated identity profile; receiving a request to perform a task that pertains to a target identity profile in the identity system, wherein the request includes an identification of the target identity profile*; because Cheng teaches a method for using workflows in an identity system, using virtual links to associate a workflow with a group that includes a target identity profile (col. 3, l. 15-col. 5, l. 16). Cheng teaches that the system has organizational objects which are sub-groups of the enterprise, such as employees and departments (col. 6, l. 40-col. 7, l. 67). Cheng teaches that the organizational model of the system can be applied in workflow systems, by using the roles to assign tasks in a workflow system (col. 13, l. 9-col. 16, l. 10; col. 16, l. 10-65).

Claim 39 cites: *identifying a plurality of workflows that perform the task and are associated with groups that include the user associated with the target identity profile; reporting the plurality of workflows via a Graphical User Interface (GUI) in response to the request; receiving a user selection of a first workflow from the plurality of workflows via the GUI*; Cheng teaches that the user may use a graphical user interface to manipulate the organizational objects and tasks (col. 11, l. 52-58; col. 12, l. 64-col. 13, l. 33; Fig. 9, 10), which suggests use of a GUI to assign workflows. Cheng teaches that the organizational model of the system can be applied in workflow systems, by using the group roles to assign tasks in a workflow system (col. 13, l. 9-col. 16, l. 10; col. 16, l. 10-65). However, Cheng does not explicitly teach that the GUI reports a set plurality of workflows to perform a task to the user and receives a selection of the workflow from the user. McNally is relied upon to teach a workflow distribution process with a GUI from which a user can select from a plurality of assigned workflows and perform steps of the workflow (col. 5, l. 61-col. 6, l. 59; Figs. 5-8).

Claim 39 further cites: *performing a first step of said first workflow with a first program to affect the target identity profile, wherein the first program comprises one of a user manager, a group manager, and an organization manager; and*

performing a second step of said first workflow with a second program, wherein the second program comprises one of the user manager, the group manager, and the organization manager and wherein the second program is different from the first program. Cheng teaches that each workflow comprises a predefined set of steps by more than one program, to perform tasks to affect the identity profile or group, and

passing information between first and second programs according to a defined set of rules (col. 16, l. 22-65; col. 17, l. 5-51). Cheng teaches that the system executes an expression at runtime to determine to who a task should be assigned, as well as querying the organizational management system, i.e., a first program of a user manager (col. 15, l. 49-col. 16, l. 21). Cheng also teaches that a workflow is defined by a procedure having a plurality of nodes with relationships defined between, where each of the nodes is defined to be performed either by the computer system or by an agent, i.e., a second program different from the first program, a part of the organizational management system (col. 16, l. 10-65).

Both Cheng and McNally are directed to the assignment of workflows and rules to users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the intuitive interface disclosed by McNally to the workflow and organization modeling system disclosed by Cheng, since McNally and Cheng recognized the need to limit access to proprietary workflow processes (McNally col. 2, l. 33-51) while facilitating collaboration between organizations (Cheng, col. 3, l. 1-12).

Regarding dependent claims 40-43, Cheng teaches that the identifier and objects of the member class have a life cycle where a member, i.e., identity profile can be archived, modified, or deleted by the authorized user associated with the member (col. 8, l. 1-51; col. 12, l. 27-64).

Regarding dependent claim 44, Cheng teaches that *said second program performs a second workflow to affect the target identity profile*, because Cheng teaches that each workflow comprises a predefined set of steps by more than one program, to

perform tasks to affect the identity profile or group, and passing information between first and second programs according to a defined set of rules (col. 16, l. 22-65; col. 17, l. 5-51).

Regarding dependent claim 45, Cheng teaches that *the second program is identified in an event catalog of the first workflow*, since Cheng teaches a flexible and dynamic role resolution in the workflow system because there are a plurality of nodes with relationships defined between by rules or regular expressions (col. 16, l. 10-65).

Regarding dependent claim 46, Cheng teaches *that the event catalog further identifies one or more parameters for passing information between the first program and the second program*, because Cheng teaches that the system queries which resource or who should be allowed or assigned to do the task (col. 16, l. 60-65).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13-16, 20, 21, 23-26, 30, 31, 33-36, and 39-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The new grounds of rejection includes the Cheng and McNally patents, which were located when a new search was performed in view of the amended claims, and which are relied upon to teach the newly claimed limitation,

reporting said set plurality workflows to a user via a Graphical User Interface (GUI), receiving from the user a selection of said first workflow from the plurality of workflows, and performing one or more steps of said first workflow; (Claim 1).

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Collier et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,815,152 issued September 1998

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amelia Rutledge whose telephone number is 571-272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for

Art Unit: 2176

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER